



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,977	07/14/2000	Aviad Zlotnick	6727/OH417	7345

7590
09/22/2005
Darby & Darby P C
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/616,977

Applicant(s)

ZLOTNICK, AVIAD

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-19 and 22-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-19 and 22-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final rejection is in response to the after-final amendment filed 11 July 2005.
2. Claims 1, 4-19, and 22-37 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 19, 30, 35, and 37 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5-11, 19, 23-29, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorie (US 5933531, patented 3 August 1999) and further in view of Jansen et al. (US 6243450, filed 28 December 1998, hereafter Jansen).

As per independent claim 1, Lorie discloses a method for processing document including information in a predefined domain, the method comprising:

- Defining a directory of data relating to the predefined domain (column 1, line 64-column 2, line 9; column 5, lines 9-12)
- Receiving from a client via a computer network images of a number of fields containing respective information (column 1, lines 16-30; column 8, lines 50-67)
- Processing the images to code the information (column 1, lines 31-36)

Art Unit: 2178

- Looking up the coded information in the directory so as to check whether the information is coded correctly (column 1, line 64- column 2, line 9)
- Returning the checked coded information (Figure 1)

Lorie fails to specifically disclose receiving payment for a service based upon a price per unit of service. However, Jansen discloses receiving payment for a service based upon a price per unit of service (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lorie's method with Jansen's method, since it would have allowed a user to receive payment for the use of service over the internet (Jansen: column 2, lines 9-11).

As per dependent claim 5, Lorie and Jansen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lorie further discloses the method wherein receiving the images comprises receiving images of alphanumeric characters in the fields (column 1, lines 21-36).

As per dependent claim 6, Lorie and Jensen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lorie further discloses the method wherein the documents include a template delineating the fields, and wherein receiving the images of the characters comprises receiving the images of the characters filled into the fields and remaining after drop-out of the template from the image of the fields (column 1, lines 16-30).

As per dependent claim 7, Lorie and Jansen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lorie further discloses

the method wherein processing the images comprises applying computerized optical character recognition (OCR) to code the characters (column 1, lines 31-36).

As per dependent claim 8, Lorie and Jensen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 7, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lorie further discloses the method wherein looking up the coded information comprises selecting a preferred reading of the characters from among two or more possible readings generated by the OCR, responsive to the data in the directory (column 4, lines 19-32).

As per dependent claim 9, Lorie and Jensen discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lorie further discloses the method wherein looking up the coded information comprises generating a confidence score, and wherein processing the images comprises passing the images to a human operator for coding when the confidence score is below a predetermined threshold (column 5, lines 1-54).

As per dependent claim 10, Lorie and Jensen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 7, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lorie further discloses the method wherein looking up the coded information comprises detecting an error in the coded characters and correcting the error using the data in the directory (column 4, lines 19-32: Here, the context analyzer attempts to correct errors based upon the context of the data).

As per dependent claim 11, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10. Claim 11 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 19, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 19 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 23, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 5. Claim 23 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 24, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 24 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 25, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 25 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 26, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 8. Claim 26 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 27, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 27 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 28, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10. Claim 28 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 29, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 11. Claim 29 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 35, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 35 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 36, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 36 is similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

5. Claims 4 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorie and Jensen and further in view of Bruce et al. (US 6741724, filed 24 March 2000, hereafter Bruce).

As per dependent claim 4, Lorie and Jensen disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lorie fails to specifically disclose defining the directory comprises selecting data specific to the predefined domain from one or more general databases. However, Bruce discloses defining the directory comprises selecting data specific to the predefined domain from one or more general databases (column 2, lines 34-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lorie and Jensen's method with Bruce's method, since it would have allowed a user to validate scanned data against accepted data (column 2, lines 57-60).

As per dependent claim 22, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 22 is similarly rejected.

6. Claims 12-16, 18, 30-34, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorie and further in view of Bruce.

As per independent claim 12, Lorie discloses a method for processing forms, each form including a field that is filled in with information in a predefined domain, the method comprising:

- Defining, in advance of reading out contents of the forms for processing, a directory of data relating to the predefined domain (column 1, line 64- column 2, line 9; column 5, lines 9-12)
- Receiving from a client via a computer network the information that is filled into the field on the forms by a plurality of users in communication with the client (column 1, lines 16-30; column 8, lines 50-67)
- Checking whether the information is correct by looking up the information in the directory (column 1, line 64- column 2, line 9)

Lorie fails to specifically disclose defining the directory comprises selecting data specific to the predefined domain from one or more general databases. However, Bruce discloses defining the directory comprises selecting data specific to the predefined domain from one or more general databases (column 2, lines 34-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lorie and Jensen's method with Bruce's method, since it would have allowed a user to validate scanned data against accepted data (column 2, lines 57-60).

As per dependent claim 13, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those disclosed by Lorie with respect to claim 1. Claim 13 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 14, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those disclosed by Lorie with respect to claim 7. Claim 14 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 15 the applicant discloses limitations similar to those disclosed by Lorie with respect to claim 1. Claim 15 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 16 the applicant discloses limitations similar to those disclosed by Lorie with respect to claim 1. Claim 16 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 18, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those disclosed by Lorie with respect to claim 10. Claim 18 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 30, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 30 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 13. Claim 31 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 32, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 32 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 33, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 16. Claim 33 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 34, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 18. Claim 34 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 37, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 37 is similarly rejected.

7. Claims 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorie and Bruce and further in view of Jensen.

As per dependent claim 17, Lorie and Bruce disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Lorie fails to specifically disclose receiving payment for a service based upon a price per unit of service.

However, Jansen discloses receiving payment for a service based upon a price per unit of service (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Lorie and Bruce's method with Jansen's method, since it would have allowed a user to receive payment for the use of service over the internet (Jansen: column 2, lines 9-11).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cesar Paula", written in a cursive style.

**CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER**